

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as rendered obvious and unpatentable, over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Van Clifton. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reason(s).

Applicant's admitted prior art comprises all that is claimed in claim 1 except the feature of *power interruption delay charging means for gradually lowering said input voltage to said H/V processor constant voltage circuit when power supplied to said display device is interrupted*, which is deemed to be non-obvious in view of the proposed combination of art.

The Examiner applies Van Martin in an erroneous attempt to obviate the claims. The Examiner refers us to col. 2, lines 64-72, which state:

The control grid 14 is clamped to a negative DC bias voltage -V1 from the power supply by a diode 44 connected between voltage -V1 and the control grid 14 and a capacitor 45 connected between the control grid 14 and ground. The output of the unblank driver 22 thereby controls the voltage between the control grid 14 and the cathode 13 by controlling the voltage of cathode 13. This diode-capacitor network makes the voltage at the control grid 14 drop slowly even though its bias voltage -V1 is removed.

Van Martin fails to teach or suggest, to one of ordinary skill in the art, gradually lowering the input voltage to a H/V processor constant voltage circuit when power supplied to the display device is interrupted. Instead Van Martin would have suggested only what Van Martin teaches, *i.e.*,

clamping a control grid (not shown) of the monitor of Applicant's admitted prior art to a negative DC bias voltage -V1 from a power supply by a diode connected between voltage -V1 and the control grid and a capacitor connected between the control grid and ground. The application of the protection circuit, *i.e.*, diode 44 and capacitor 45 in Van Martin, for making the voltage at the control grid 14 drop slowly even though its bias voltage -V1 is removed, is absolutely different than that claimed in claim 1, *power interruption delay charging means for gradually lowering said input voltage to said H/V processor constant voltage circuit when power supplied to said display device is interrupted* (emphasis added).

Similarly, claim 3 calls for *power interruption delay charging means for gradually lowering said DC input voltage received by said horizontal deflection circuit when said AC power supplied to said power supply circuit is interrupted*; and claim 8 calls for *power interruption delay charging means for gradually lowering said input voltage to said H/V processor constant voltage circuit when power supplied to said display device is interrupted*.

The Examiner offers no explanation of how or why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply diode 44 and capacitor 45 of Van Martin to the input of H/V processor constant voltage circuit of Applicant's admitted prior art. As noted above, Van Martin teaches, slowly dropping the voltage at the control grid 14 of the monitor which is in no way similar to *gradually lowering said input voltage to said H/V processor constant voltage circuit* as set forth in claim 1. *In re Rijckaert*, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (CAFC 1993) states:

"*A prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.*" *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 782, 26

USPQ2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *In re Rhinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 1051, 189 USPQ 143, 147 (CCPA 1976). If the examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-11 is deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn.

The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, withdraw the objections and/or rejections and pass the application to issue in view of the above amendments and/or remarks.

Should a Petition for extension of time be required with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is kindly requested to treat this paragraph as such a request and is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of the incurred fee if, **and only if**, a petition for extension of time be required **and** a check of the requisite amount is not enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27,774

1522 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel. No. (202) 408-9040
Date: February 13, 2001
I.D.: REB/MDP/jx

RECEIVED
FEB 14 2001
TC 2600 MAILROOM